

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is prepared in response to the first Office action mailed on 11 December 2006 (Paper No. 20061126). Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1 through 13 and 15 through 24 will be pending. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2 and 12 by this amendment and has newly added claims 22 through 24 by this amendment.

**Specification**

On Page 3 of Paper No. 20061126, the Examiner objected to the specification because the title of the invention is not descriptive. Applicant has amended the title of the invention by this amendment to overcome this objection.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

On Page 3 of Paper No. 20061126, the Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claim 12 by this amendment making this rejection moot.

Applicant has also amended claims 1 and 2 by this amendment to correct for minor errors.

**Prior Art Rejections**

In Paper No. 20061126, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ha (US 6,437,507) in view of Aoki *et al.* (US 5,951,350). Applicant has the following comments.

**Regarding Applicant's claim 1**, Applicant claims, "each ridge having a top surface being of a water repellant film". On Page 4 of paper No. 20061126, the Examiner states that this limitation is taught by reference numeral 110 of FIG. 19 of Aoki. Applicant disagrees.

Applicant submits that FIG. 19 of Aoki is Embodiment 9 of Aoki and is described on column 18, line 21 to column 19, line 36 of Aoki. Applicant submits that column 18, lines 45-50 of Aoki states, "This construction solves a problem that the fluorescent substances having stuck to the top of the partition walls become a hindrance in bonding the front panel and the back panel with a sealing glass. The water-repellant film 110 does not remain in the completed PDPs since the it is burned away when the fluorescent substance layer is baked". This clearly indicates that water-repellant film 110 of Aoki never is part of the final structure of the PDP in Aoki as it is burned away when the fluorescent layer is baked. Because water-repellant film 110 is not part of the final structure of Aoki, it can not read on Applicant's claims. In Applicant's invention, the water repellant film 22/52 is a silicon dioxide film, and this silicon dioxide film 22/52 becomes part of the final structure of Applicant's PDPas is evidenced by FIGS. 5B and 11B. Because Aoki's water-repellant layer 110 is never part of

the final structure of Aoki, Applicant submits that the combination of Ha and Aoki does not teach or suggest Applicant's claim 1.

**Regarding Applicant's claim 3**, Applicant claims, "wherein each second electrode comprises a flat top surface that is parallel to said top surface of each ridge, said top surface of each second electrode being bounded by said concave portions". On Page 5 of Paper No. 20061126, the Examiner addresses this limitation by saying, "Regarding claim 3, Ha ('507) teaches each of the second electrode comprises a flat top surface that is parallel to the top surface of each ridge, the top surface of each second electrode being bounded by the concave portions." Applicant disagrees.

Applicant submits that Ha does not teach the electrodes in the concave portions having a flat top surface. To the contrary, Applicant submits that Ha teaches that the top surfaces of the electrodes formed in the concave portions are also concave and nearly match the surface profile of the concave sections. This is evidenced by FIGS. 3 through 6 of Ha and by column 2, lines 39-45 of Ha which state that these electrodes are curved arc forms. Because Ha does not teach the second electrodes as having a flat top surface, Applicant submits that Ha can not possibly teach Applicant's claim 3.

**Regarding the rejection of each of Applicant's claims 1, 3, 4 and 21**, the Examiner relies on Ha for a teaching of nearly every feature with the exception of the water repellant

film. For this, the Examiner turns to Aoki for an alleged such teaching. From this, the Examiner concludes that the combination of Ha and Aoki would teach each of Applicant's claims 1, 3, 4 and 21. Applicant disagrees.

Ha pertains to a PDP having a hollow cathode type structure where an electrode in the form of a groove or arc to provide in the rear substrate to provide a larger discharge area in the discharge cell. Meanwhile, Aoki pertains to a traditional electrode and barrier rib structure with rectangular shaped barrier ribs and discharge cells with the address electrodes formed as stripes on the rear substrate. Applicant submits that if Ha were to be modified according to Aoki, the primary purpose of Ha would be destroyed. This is because Aoki never teaches curved discharge cells or curved electrodes or a need to enlarge a discharge cell. Therefore, Applicant submits that Ha as modified according to Aoki would teach the traditional rectangular design of barrier ribs and address electrodes. Therefore, Applicant submits that Ha as modified according to Aoki could not possibly teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention.

Applicant has newly added claims 22 through 24 to more broadly claim Applicant's structure. These claims emphasize the fact that the tops of the second electrodes are flat while their bottoms are curved. Applicant submits that neither Ha nor Aoki teach or suggest such a structure for an electrode. Entry of and favorable examination are respectfully requested.

A fee of \$350.00 is incurred in the filing of this amendment for the addition of one (1) more independent claim in excess of 3 and for the addition of three (3) more claims in excess of 20.

In view of the above, it is submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are patentable over the cited references, taken either alone or combination and accordingly should now be in a conditions suitable for allowance.

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon all of the claims now present in the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell,  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56905  
Date: 1/26/07  
I.D.: REB/ML